



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The two representations of the "tent of meeting" in Numbers and in Exodus cannot be denied. The arguments against the position of the critics are unsatisfactory, e. g., (1) the critics themselves differ; a theory reigns for a time and is then overthrown; (2) Deuteronomy, if not the work of Moses, is a forgery. The strength of the critical position lies in the cumulative argument by which it is supported. The analysis rests upon a *combination* of resemblances and differences. The theory of Wellhausen, with certain restrictions, seems to be the most satisfactory. If it be asked, Could not Moses writing under Divine inspiration, have issued the laws without waiting for them to be developed? the answer is; yes; but as a matter of fact, revelation is progressive, and we cannot determine upon antecedent considerations how much or how little it may have pleased God to reveal to a particular agent of his will; to determine this, we must study the history, and the observed facts are consistent with the Wellhausen and not with the traditional theory. There is needed a more comprehensive theory of inspiration, and a wider view of the forces that have coöperated in the production of the Bible. It must be remembered, in all this, that critical investigations concern really, not the *fact* of revelation, but its mode, or form, or course; upon Christian faith and practice they have no bearing whatever.

If you wish to read a really strong advocacy of the Wellhausen hypothesis, without the technical material which generally forms a part of such a discussion,—an advocacy presented reverently and cautiously, read this article.

---

**The Prophecy of Isaiah.\***—Isaiah is characterized by the wide scope, the far-reaching perspective and the vividness of his visions; by the brilliancy of his diction, the sublimity of his theism, and the spirituality of his teachings. Isaiah's prophecies are a panorama, in advance, of the great scenes of future history; the outcome is in the lowly person and theocratic rule of the Messiah; the scheme, however, does not end until millennial glory is attained. The sixty-six chapters are all the work of *one* Isaiah: (1) the external testimony is overwhelming against the hypothesis of a duplex authorship; (2) the two portions of Isaiah's prophecies are not only not discrepant, but actually harmonious, and mutually sustain each other; for (a) few new topics are introduced in the latter half of the book; (b) the suffering Messiah is brought in in the first part as well as in the second, and there is no difficulty in supposing Cyrus to have been named long beforehand; (c) there is no distinctive peculiarity in the style or phraseology of the writer in these two portions of the book such as to negative the identity. The theory of a second Isaiah has been propounded to get rid of the prediction of the name of Cyrus and the suffering of Christ, and thus destroy this clinching proof of inspiration and religious doctrine. The tendency to doubt the validity of prophecy as an evidence of the truth of the Bible or as a ground of revelation is to be deprecated. The testimony of prophecy has been emphasized by Isaiah himself, and by the New Testament writers, and by our Lord. The trail of the Edenic serpent can be discerned in the work of those who are throwing discredit upon one of the two main buttresses of biblical truth. The old and well-established opinions must stand. It is time for the alarm to be sounded against the imposture and the effrontery of the pseudo-critic.

We wish that every reader of the STUDENT might read this presentation. It clearly exhibits some of the most striking differences which exist between the old and newer schools.

\* By Professor James Strong, S. T. D., Madison, N. J., in *The Methodist Review*, March-April, 1890, pp. 169-183.